



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,284	06/20/2003	Steve Burns	50277-2139	9791

42425 7590 09/14/2007
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER

TSUI, WILSON W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mnv

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/600,284

Applicant(s)

BURNS ET AL.

Examiner

Wilson Tsui

Art Unit

2178

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 September 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-46.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment to independent claim 18 changes the scope of the invention, and thus requires new search and consideration. Although the applicant argues that claim 18 clearly covered a portlet-generated component that is configured to receive user input, the examiner has explained in the previous office action, the reasons for why independent claim 18 was NOT clear (as evidenced in page 11 of applicant's remarks ... "this amendment to claim 18 makes it clear ..."), and thus, since the amended "previously generated" limitation is different in scope and meaning than the "generates" term used in the previous claim language, new search and consideration is required. Additionally, the applicant first argues that a window display area and window pane cannot possibly be equivalent to a portlet that generates a component of a page. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees, since by definition of a portlet as quoted from www.wikipedia.com: "Portlets are ... displayed in a web portal and a portal page is displayed as a collection of ... portlet windows, where each portlet window displays a portlet". Thus, the display area, and window pane, both represent a component of a page, displayed in a web portal/application window, since the display area and window pane show generated data. With regards to the applicant arguing that obviously, the elements from ABRAMS that correspond to a portlet parameter and a page parameter cannot be the same element because if they were a mapping between them (they) would not need to be inspected to figure out which page parameter corresponds to which portlet parameter. However, the applicant's argument is not persuasive, since the applicant is arguing that the mapping must be pre-existing/pre-defined, which the claim language does not require, and thus is arguing limitations not present in the claimed language. The applicant also argues that "by asserting that portlet parameters and page parameters correspond to user-specified "data", the final office action fails to recognize the difference between a parameter and a parameter value which is that a parameter can take on different values". However, this argument is not persuasive since as explained in the previous office action, the user defines (Abrams, column 2, 6-12) particular requirements to be used as parameters for components. These components are configured with respect to the parameters, such that they are displayed with values passed into them based upon defined parameters. With regards to claim 18, the applicant argues that it does not include the limitations of claim 1 with respect to page parameters or a mapping that involves page parameters. However, this argument is not persuasive since claim 1 has been explained/shown to teach those limitations, as explained above. Additionally, with respect to claim 18, the applicant argues that ABRAMS does not describe or suggest a mapping that maps both events to actions and event output parameters to page parameters. However, this argument is not persuasive since as explained in the previous office action, a URL selection event is generated, and the URL selection event is recognized, such that the URL selection event specify page parameter values (column 4, lines 1-21, and column 6, lines 25-32). Thus, the cause of an event is mapped to a particular type of action to be performed, and thus, the argument is not persuasive. With respect to applicant's argument that dependent claims 2-17, 19-46 are allowable, since their respective independent claims are allowable is not persuasive, since their respective independent claims have been shown to be rejected.


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER